IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE SIDE

Anticipatory Bail application No. 2025 of 2006
in
CR. No. 169 of 2005

Mandar Raviraj Rao ... Applicant

vs.

State through MIDC Police Station ... Respondent.

Mr. B. P. Pandey, advocate for applicant
Ms. M. H. Mhatre APP for respondent

CORAM: K. J. ROHEE J.
DATE: 17/5/2006

P.C.:

Heard Mr. B. P. Pandey, advocate for applicant and Ms. M. H. Mhatre APP for respondent / State. The only role attributed to the applicant is that the main accused was his employee who obtained a car loan. In this view of the matter I think it expedient to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant. Hence the order:

The applicant be released on bail on his executing a personal recognition for Rs.10000/- with one surety in the like amount in the event of his arrest in Crime No. 169 of 2005 under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 474 of IPC.

The applicant is directed to make himself available as and when required by the Investigating Officer and to cooperate with the investigation.

(K. J. ROHEE J)

By consetn S.O. to 14th June 2006. Status quo to continue till then.

3182 -06

Heard counsel for the parites. The father may come to Mumbai sto see his daugh ter Anita on 21st May, 28th May and 4th June between 11 a.m. To 2 p.m. At Eskay Resort, Near Yogi Nagar, Borivli West. The mother or anybody on her behalf shall bring daughter Anita at the address given above.

S. O. to 13th June 2006.

1227 -06

APP seeks further time to file reply. Time granted. S.O. to 6th June 2006. Interim order to continue till then.

1169-06

Heard cousnel for the petitioner and for respondent nos. 1 and 2 as well as APP for respondent nos. 3 and 4, who seeks timeto file reply. Time granted. S.O. for 2 weeks.

1166-06

Heard counsel for the petitioner . APP for respondent no.1. Issue notice to respondent nos. 2 and 3. In the meanwhile the State is directed not to take coercive steps in respect of Crime FIR No. 215 of 2006. S.O. , after vacation.

1958-06

Heard counsel for the applicant and APP for the State.

The FIR dated 14.4.06 clearly attributes major role to the applicant. Hence i am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail. Application rejected.

1973 -06

Heard counsel for the applicants and APP for State. A perusal of the report dated 7.4.2006 shows that the names of applicants do not at all appear in the FIR. FIR also does not disclose any offence under the Prevention of Attrocities Act. Hence I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail .

Hence the order:

The applicants be released on bail on their executing a personal bond of Rs.5000/- with one surety in the like amount in the event of their arrest in Crime No. 172 of 2006 under Sections 363, 342, 324, 323 and 307 IPC, The applicants are directed to make themselves available as and when required by the Investigating Officer and to cooperate with the investigation.